

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 17-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Geib for conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on May 8, 2009. During the interview, Examiner Geib and Applicants' representative discussed the independent claims, the applied reference(s), and the grounds of rejection. The substance of the interview is reflected by the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 17-20, 22-27, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Architecture and Application of a Dynamically Reconfigurable Hardware Array for Future Mobil Communication Systems" to Alsolaim et al. (hereinafter "Alsolaim") in view of United States Patent No. 4,791,603 to Henry (hereinafter "Henry"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) the cited references, when combined, must teach or suggest every element of the claim. *See* MPEP § 2143.03, for example. Applicants respectfully submit that Alsolaim and Henry, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element recited in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Alsolaim and Henry, whether taken alone or in combination, are insufficient to render amended independent claim 1 obvious under § 103(a). For example, amended independent claim 1 recites the following language, in relevant part:

a memory unit to store input data for a plurality of functions, wherein each function comprises a communications signal processing task.

Applicants respectfully submit that Alsolaim fails to teach or suggest, each and every element recited in amended independent claim 1. Alsolaim, on page 209, teaches a RPU-controller guiding data manipulations and transfers within the RPU. The operations shown in table 1 on page 209 include multiplication, division, addition and subtraction.

As indicated above, the Office Action, on pages 2 and 9, state that the RPU-controller in Alsolaim guides all operations and therefore it must inherently select a function. The Office Action equates an operation in Alsolaim with the function recited in claim 1. However, Alsolaim merely teaches a simple operation such as addition or subtract action. By way of contrast, the amended claimed subject matter teaches that each function comprises a communications signal processing task. Alsolaim fails to teach wherein each function comprises a communications signal processing task. Accordingly, Alsolaim fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the missing language of the claimed subject matter for at least these reasons.

Henry does not overcome the deficiencies of Alsolaim. Henry teaches a dynamically reconfigurable array logic with in-system logical reconfiguration in real time. *See* Henry at Abstract. By way of contrast, the amended claimed subject matter teaches that each function comprises a communications signal processing task. Henry fails to teach a memory unit to store input data for a plurality of functions, wherein each function comprises a communications signal processing task. Accordingly, Henry fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the missing language of the claimed subject matter for at least this additional reason.

Even if Alsolaim and Henry could be combined, which Applicants do not admit, such combination would not teach or suggest all the features of amended independent claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify Alsolaim and/or Henry to include all the features of amended independent claim 1. Consequently, Alsolaim and Henry, whether taken alone or in combination, are insufficient to render amended independent claim 1 obvious under § 103(a).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 is allowable and that dependent claims 2, 4, and 7-11 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits. In addition, amended independent claims 17 and 24 recite features similar to those recited by amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 17 and 24 are allowable for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to amended independent claim 1 and that dependent claims 18-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29, and 30 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-4, 7-11, 17-20, 22-27, 29 and 30.

Claims 5, 6, 21, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alsolaim in view of Henry, and further in view of USPN 4,862,407 to Fette et al. ("Fette"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1, 17 and 24 are allowable and that dependent claims 5, 6, 21, and 28 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 5, 6, 21, and 28.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 17-30 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicants do not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

/Rebecca M. Bachner/

Rebecca M. Bachner, Reg. No. 54,865
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: June 2, 2009

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O CPA GLOBAL
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402